

# APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

## REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD MONDAY, APRIL 12, 2010

1. CONVENE: 7:07 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Board Member Cunningham
3. ROLL CALL:  
**Present:** President Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice-President Autorino,  
Board Members Cunningham, Kohlstrand, Zuppan and Lynch

**Absent:** Board member Cook

4. MINUTES:

Minutes from the meeting of March 22, 2010 (Pending)

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:  
None.

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

### Written Report

#### **6-A** Future Agendas

Staff presented an overview of future Planning Board hearings.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked what the differences were between the future meetings on the Boatworks project.

The Planning Services Manager stated that the first May meeting will be a workshop that will give an opportunity to the Public and Planning Board to provide comment and input on the proposed development and site plan and provide feedback to architects for the project. The June 14<sup>th</sup> meeting will be a public hearing at which the Planning Board will be developing a recommendation to the City Council on the project.

Board Member Kohlstrand asked why the joint meeting was being held with the Economic Development Commission.

The Planning Services Manager stated that there is a joint meeting to review and discuss the proposed North Park Street Form-based Code and the amendments to the Park & Webster Street Parking Requirements. A joint meeting was planned because it allowed an opportunity for the Board and Commission to interact and consider comments on a set of

regulations that were related to the economic and land use potential for the area.

## **6-B Zoning Administrator Report**

Staff noted that on April 6, 2010 the Zoning Administrator approved a use permit application that allowed an existing telecommunications tower at Alameda Point to remain for another 10 years.

### **7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

None

### **8. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

None

### **9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:**

**9-A Density Bonus Ordinance – Applicant – City of Alameda.** Proposed caps and limits on concessions and/or incentives for Density Bonus Projects on sites in a residential zone district or a site with a general plan land use designation of residential.

The Planning Services Manager presented the draft amendment to the Density Bonus regulations.

Mr. Buckley, Alameda Architectural Preservation Society representative, discussed the comment letter sent to the Planning Board regarding the differences between the last ordinance draft and the ordinance draft being considered by the Board this evening. He encouraged the board to include caps and limits on the concessions and incentives as provided in the last draft.

Ms. Lambden, Citizen, expressed concern that the draft ordinance being considered by the Board this evening lacked caps on concessions. She stated this would only spur on unfavorable development. She also suggested changes to the previous ordinance draft considered by the Planning Board.

President Ezzy Ashcraft closed the public hearing.

Board member Cunningham voiced concern that the latest draft does not contain limits or caps on the concessions and incentives. He stated that managing a developer's proposal may be difficult in the future without including such limits. He supports developing parameters and caps similar to those presented in the first ordinance draft. He also supports the development of Design Guidelines for density bonus projects that are similar to the existing Residential Design Guidelines. He added these would benefit the design of projects going into existing residential neighborhoods.

Board Member Kohlstrand expressed support for staff's first ordinance draft, which included caps or limits on concessions. She supports eliminating required front and side yard setbacks in certain instances so that developments with unique arrangements for building placement and common open space usage can at least be considered.

Vice-President Autorino asked for a clarification on the difference between the original draft ordinance and the version at hand. He also requested that staff clarify the role of design guidelines. He noted he is not in support of allowing an increase in lot coverage on a site.

Board Member Lynch stated support for the original version of the Draft ordinance that provided caps and limits on concessions. He added that this would provide more certainty to the process.

Board Member Zuppan said that she supports developing design guidelines and including caps and limits on incentives. She pointed out this would put the City in a better negotiating position when considering future developments.

At this point, President Ezzy Ashcraft asked if the Board could develop a recommendation on an ordinance amendment that included elements from the current and previous ordinance drafts. She also suggested that language from the agenda report be included in the ordinance draft, which provides a sense of purpose and intent.

Following a discussion amongst Board members, draft ordinance language was developed that included caps and limits on concessions or incentives, allowed for consideration of exceptions to the caps and limits for developments on sites of at least one acre, and provided purpose plus intent language.

Staff restated the elements to be included in the draft ordinance amendment to be recommended to the City Council.

On a motion by Kohlstrand, seconded the Cunningham, the Board voted 6-0 to recommend the amendment to the Density Bonus Ordinance, as modified during the evening discussions, to the City Council.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

12. ADJOURNMENT: 8:57 p.m.